

WHAT DOES

*Social
Credit*

STAND FOR

By SOLON LOW

— AS QUIZZED BY —

BLAIR FRASER

[REPRINTED FROM
MACLEAN'S MAGAZINE]

If Social Credit were to win in Canada would we have private enterprise or state control?—collective bargaining?—social insurance?—higher or lower tariffs?—membership in a new league of nations?—closer ties to the Empire?—Solon Low, national leader of the movement, gives the answers in response to 33 questions on his policies.

What Does SOCIAL CREDIT Stand For ?

“Reprinted from Maclean’s Magazine, April 15th, 1945. Maclean’s published ‘What Does Social Credit Stand For?’ in the normal course of its presentation of current national affairs. Such publication does not necessarily constitute endorsement by Maclean’s of the views expressed therein.”

What Does Social Credit Stand For?

THIS is the fifth quiz of national political leaders to appear in Maclean's. The CCF policy was outlined by M. J. Coldwell, M.P., in the Sept. 1, 1943, issue; the Bloc Populaire's by Maxime Raymond, M.P., in the Jan. 1, 1944, issue; that of the Progressive Conservatives by John Bracken in the May 1, 1944, issue; and that of the Liberal Party by Prime Minister Mackenzie King in the issue of Feb. 1, 1945.

BEFORE answering your questions on definite aspects of Social Credit, I should begin by outlining, very briefly, some salient points upon which there appears to be widespread misunderstanding.

In the first place Social Credit is not simply a scheme of monetary reform. It is essentially a policy of a philosophy of life—and specifically the Christian and democratic philosophy. The basis of this is that the ultimate goal of man is something toward which the most rapid progress can be made if the individual has freedom for the expression and expansion of his personality. Therefore, in the organization of human society, all functional activities should be subordinated to the freedom and welfare of the human individual.

Freedom within the natural restrictions of society can be defined as the right of a person to choose whether he will do or refrain from doing any one thing at a time, provided that he does not interfere with the same right of every other person.

Democracy in its true meaning alone provides such a social system. Despite the confusion which exists regard-

ing this much abused word "democracy," it is a very definite system of organization which provides for "the government and management of a people's affairs in accordance with their will." In other words a properly functioning democracy gives the people the results they want.

As any industrialist or engineer will testify, organization is a science, in regard to which certain fundamental principles must be observed. This applies to the organization of democracy. Because a democracy must give the people the results they want, the people must be the supreme authority for deciding the results they get from their various social activities. This authority is non-existent unless they can obtain obedience to their collective will. Any authority conferred upon an individual for purposes of administration must, therefore, be delegated to him by the people and must be subject to withdrawal by them at will. Moreover, such a person must be responsible to the people for the results of his administration. This applies in both the political and economic fields.

The objective of Social Credit is the greatest possible measure of personal freedom, and all this implies in terms of maximum personal economic security, for every individual within a properly functioning democracy. And because the philosophy and principles of such a democracy are inherent in Christianity the policy of Social Credit can be stated correctly as being directed toward the establishment of a Christian social order.

Christian democracy is something that mankind has never tried—but the sheer pressure of events is driving us towards that goal. The opposite social system from democracy is dictatorship, in which all power is central-

ized in a ruling or dominating group. The philosophy of this form of society is that man lives by bread alone, that all human effort must be directed toward supplying the material needs of men; that some superior person or organization vested with power and clothed with the prestige of institutions, such as the state, the party, etc., constitutes the only deity men require. It is essentially pagan and anti-Christian and will inevitably lead to chaos and disaster.

The conflict in the world today is between these two opposing ways of life. The Social Credit movement is endeavouring to clarify this issue in the growing confusion of world events and is putting forward the principles which must be observed, and certain definite proposals based on these, if an orderly transition is to be made from the present rapid advance toward the totalitarian state to a properly functioning democracy.

Social Credit is not a political party doctrine any more than democracy or Christianity are political party doctrines. The only reason that the Social Credit movement has entered the federal political field is because, despite their professions of being democratic, the various political groups show no evidence of adopting the reforms essential to establishing a properly functioning democracy.

(1) Question—As I understand it the Social Credit proposals should balance the nation's buying power with the total prices of goods available by creating new money enough to buy any surplus goods. How would this new money be issued? How distributed? Who would decide who was to get how much?

Answer—That is correct. Under peacetime conditions the present monetary system fails to distribute sufficient purchasing power to enable the people to buy the goods

produced or exchanged for imports. This results in an unsaleable surplus accumulating which can be got rid of only by the creation of debt, or export markets. Because of the restriction of the home market, production is curtailed, savage competition develops, unemployment increases, nations compete with nations in "blasting their way" into each other's markets, thus sowing the seeds for war; and generally there develop the conditions of poverty amidst plenty, conditions so apparent in the pre-war years.

The Social Credit proposal for dealing with this defect in the monetary system is simple. A national monetary authority, responsible to the people through Parliament, would ascertain the amount of the deficiency of purchasing power and authorize the creation of the new money to make good the deficiency. This new money would be issued to the people and purchasing power in a manner which would secure the desired objectives in a democracy, namely, the greatest possible measure of freedom of the individual and the economic security and independence for him which this entails. At the same time it will be necessary to ensure that no inflationary rise in prices takes place because of the increased demand for goods.

In order to meet this requirement the additional purchasing power could be distributed as follows:

1. Partly as a national dividend payable to every citizen as a right to supplement earned incomes, and sufficient in amount to ensure basic economic security. This would give every person economic independence and REAL freedom. (No man is free if he is forced to accept the wages and working conditions imposed upon him by another or, as an alternative, face destitution for himself and his dependants.) Because people are

not conditioned to freedom, during the initial period it would probably be necessary to make the dividend conditional upon a man being willing to accept employment under suitable conditions if his services were required for work he was qualified to do.

2. Partly in the form of a drastic reduction of taxation and its progressive reduction thereafter. Taxation is an attack by the state on the freedom of the citizen—a fact which we seem to have forgotten under the tyrannous tax system that has been imposed on us.

3. The balance would be paid out in the form of a subsidy to retail merchants on condition that they sold their goods to the public at a discount and, during the initial stage, operated at an agreed ratio of profit on their turnover.

The amount of the dividend and price discount would, of course, depend upon the volume of national production. Thus the deciding factors would be actual economic conditions. The relative ratio which would be distributed as dividends, price discounts and tax reductions would be decided by Parliament.

(2) **Question**—Is it true Social Credit promises a \$25-a-month “social dividend” to everybody?

Answer—Social Credit does not make promises. It is the extent and richness of our resources, the technical and scientific advances made by our skilled engineers and technicians and the consequent productive capacity of Canada as a whole that make the promises. But the adoption of the Social Credit financial proposals would involve the distribution of national or social dividends. This is THE key to economic democracy. However, the amount which each individual would receive would depend upon the national production and the extent to which

power-driven machinery was replacing manpower in the economic field. Canada's present productive capacity in relation to population and power production development is sufficient to ensure at least \$25 a month and probably more.

(3) Question—If your Government sets up an authority to decide how much new money is to be created at any given time, how would you make this authority responsible to a democratically elected Parliament?

Answer—Let me state again that any government can introduce the Social Credit reforms for establishing a properly functioning democracy. "The national monetary authority" which would be responsible for the operation of the financial system could be the executive board of the Bank of Canada, the personnel of which would be appointed by the Federal Government. This board would be responsible to Parliament through the Minister of Finance; Parliament, in turn, would be responsible to the people and would lay down general policy in accordance with the "will of the people." If the board failed to provide the desired results, the people would bring pressure on their M.P.'s and these in turn would insist on the Government changing the personnel of the board. However, effective control can be exercised by the people only if they control their parliamentary representatives every day of the year and not merely one day every four or five years.

(4) Question—What changes, if any, would you make in our present party system of parliamentary democracy? Would you still have elections every five years?

Answer—If we are to have effective political democracy then Parliament must be brought under the responsible and continuous control of the electorate. The electorate

must be able to state the results wanted, in definite and coherent terms, and must be able to insist on obedience to their collective wishes. For this purpose the people must be organized to fulfill their electoral responsibilities and exercise their constitutional authority—for it is an elementary principle that a number of persons can carry out an undertaking only if they are organized for the purpose. An unorganized body of people is a mob—and a mob is incapable of expressing a coherent policy or acting in unison.

The exact form of this organization will depend upon what the people--the supreme authority--want. One type of democratic electoral system being suggested by a body of war veterans provides for a non-party organization of all electors into units of 100. Each 100 is subdivided into groups of 10 which can meet in each other's homes. These groups of 10 would each operate under a chairman who would hold office at the pleasure of group members. The group members would decide all questions of policy. The chairmen of the groups of 10 would form the hundred council under a chairman holding office at its pleasure. The chairmen of the hundreds in a district would again be grouped as district councils and the chairmen of district councils in a constituency would form the constituency council. A member of Parliament would be responsible to his constituents through this constituency council, the personnel of which would be under the continuous control of the general membership in the groups.

Such an electoral organization would be completely effective, for a united and organized electorate with effective control being exercised by its general membership would be irresistible in exercising its authority with res-

ponsibility. No representative would dare to disobey his constituents, for thus organized the latter could remove him at will. If such an electoral organization was favoured by the people, then to make it completely effective, members of Parliament should be paid by those whom they represent through the constituency electoral organization and would hold office so long as they gave satisfaction to their constituents. It would mean the end of party politics—and, possibly, of general elections. The people would control Parliament all the time.

That is one method of organizing an effective political democracy. It could be done in other ways.

(5) Question—Exactly what changes do you plan to make in our present banking system? Should the ordinary commercial banks be publicly or privately owned?

Answer—The changes in the banking system which would be involved by the adoption of Social Credit reforms are relatively simple. The issuing authority for all money, both currency and credit, would be the national monetary authority. The banks would be required to hold cash or its equivalent in national credit certificates against their total deposits, so that they could always meet their deposit liabilities in full. They would be authorized to grant production loans, in accordance with ordinary and well-established banking practice, to finance all production for which there is a demand. In lieu of interest it would be desirable to substitute an equitable system of service charges. In short, the banks would continue to fulfill their present functions, except that they would have no power to issue money except as agents for the national monetary authority, nor would they have any control of economic policy. They would be elevated to the status of the nation's servants—and would enjoy increased prestige and greatly

expanded business opportunities but without any vestige of power over the national economy.

It is most desirable that the commercial banks should be in healthy competition to give the best service possible to customers, and this could not be achieved under so-called "public ownership." However if the banks refused to operate under the new conditions, naturally Parliament would have no option but to nationalize banking.

(6) Question—What would be your policy toward Canada's gold mining industry?

Answer—Under a Social Credit economy the policy in regard to gold mining would be the same as in regard to the mining of coal, iron or anything else. Gold is simply a metal—a commodity—and so long as there was a market for it the financial facilities would be available for mining it.

(7) Question—Would you give any protection to Canadian manufacturing industries? By tariff? By subsidy? If the latter, how would you fix the amount of the subsidy paid by each company or factory?

Answer—Yes, this would be necessary for purposes of stimulating an intensive development of the national economy to meet the expanding demand for goods and services, and, at the same time, to maintain foreign trade in balance on the basis of a mutually agreeable exchange of goods and services with other countries. The policy would be to encourage imports of goods wanted by Canadians which either cannot be produced at all in Canada or which cannot be produced in sufficient quantities in this country and to discourage imports of goods that can be produced in sufficient quantities here to meet

consumer demands—while providing Canadian producers full scope to expand their production in a home market equipped with adequate purchasing power. The necessary protection to Canadian industries could be provided in several ways; first, by the reduction of freight rates for all-Canadian goods to a fraction of the present charges, the consequent loss to the railways being made good by means of subsidies; second, by a drastic reduction of taxation, thereby reducing production costs; third, by tariffs where necessary; and fourth, if the circumstances so required, by the regulation of foreign exchange so as to withhold foreign exchange for the purchase of imports that would damage the economy.

(8) Question—In party literature you propose subsidies to the retail merchant “on condition he allow his customers a price discount,” yet you oppose price fixing. How then would you fix the amount of the discount? Discount from what price?

Answer—(May I once again reiterate that the Social Credit Movement is not a party.) The amount of the retail price discount would be determined by a mathematical computation of the actual deficiency of purchasing power which exists. The manner in which this deficiency occurs is known and, therefore, it is a simple matter to compute the percentage by which retail prices must be reduced in order to balance them with the available purchasing power.

The discount would be from the ordinary selling price as now computed.

(9) Question—These discount subsidies would be paid, you say, on condition the merchants do not exceed a fair ratio of profit. What profit ratio is “fair,” and who would determine it?

Answer—The ratio of gross profit for the retail trade varies with the type of business. For example, a grocery business may require 33½% to operate economically, whereas a furniture store—with a large capital tied up in stock and a relatively slower turnover—may require 50% to operate economically. There is a recognized ratio of profit for different types of businesses, and a schedule of a “fair” ratio for each of these can be arrived at in consultation with the retail merchants’ associations.

(10) Question—Would there be any right of appeal from these official decisions on subsidies, discounts, profit ratios, etc.?

Answer—As the subsidies to merchants in return for selling their goods at a discount would be determined by economic factors and not “officials,” and the maximum profit ratio would be arrived at by agreement with the retail merchants themselves, there would be no need to provide for a “right of appeal.” No merchant would be compelled to sell his goods at a discount. He will do so only because it will be profitable to him. Actually, because of the increased business opportunities, the tendency is likely to be for merchants to reduce their ratio of profit to attract more business.

(11) Question—Do you favour a floor price for farm products? A ceiling price?

Answer—Yes. Agricultural prices should be maintained at a level which would give farmers a profit comparable to that of other industrial concerns. There is no need to have a ceiling price, because competition will take care of that.

(12) Question—Would loans to farmers and other producers have to be repaid? With interest? Would you put any ceiling on the amount of such loans?

Answer—The feature about any “loan” is that it has to be repaid. However production loans—whether to industry or agriculture—should be on such terms that enable the producer to sell his products and repay the loan. Instead of arbitrary interest charges on such loans, an equitable system of service charges should be substituted. The security and other factors involved would determine the credit worthiness of any individual borrower in determining the amount of the loan.

(13) Question — What would you do about existing farm debts, and other private debts? What about the public debt, municipal, provincial and federal? Would you pay interest and principal on Victory Bonds, for instance?

Answer—Existing farm debts and private debts would present no problem if farmers and others were receiving an income in relation to the services they were rendering the nation. However, agricultural banks for extending long- and medium-term credit facilities to farmers would be desirable, and for purposes of clearing up the farm debt problem, these institutions could take over existing farm debts on terms which would enable the farmer to handle his debt obligations easily and to re-establish his credit.

The intention is that the public debt would be systematically liquidated as opportunities were provided for the investment of the money in the rapidly expanding capital development of the economy, and this would be done without loss to a single individual. This, of course, would apply both to the principal and interest on Victory Bonds, which constitute the greater portion of the national debt.

(14) Question—How would you safeguard the value of life insurance policies? Bank deposits?

Answer—There need be no additional safeguards to those already existing in regard to life insurance policies. In the case of bank deposits because the national monetary authority would be responsible for the proper conduct of the monetary system, Parliament could guarantee the safety of bank deposits.

(15) Question—Under your system, would anyone ever have to pay taxes?

Answer—At the outset a considerable reduction in taxation could be effected immediately, to be followed by a systematic reduction thereafter.

(16) Question—You favour compulsory collective bargaining, but you say “the time may come when a scientific economy will automatically do away with the need for collective bargaining in the matter of wages and salaries.” What do you mean by this?

Answer—We are not in favour of compulsion in any form. However, existing collective bargaining machinery could be left in operation until such time as it became redundant. When workers have become conditioned to the economic independence they will enjoy from the receipt of national dividends, no man will accept wages which he considers inadequate or working conditions that are obnoxious to him. In other words, when each worker has the freedom to choose for whom he will work and the conditions under which he is prepared to work, the continual battle between employers and employees will become a thing of the past. Employers with a ready market for their goods will not be driven to keeping wages down to a minimum in order to cut costs so that they can undersell their competitors. Workers will not be faced with the alternative of accepting the working conditions imposed on them or alternatively being unemployed and destitute. Each will work in harmony with the other.

(17) Question—Are you in favour of health insurance? Unemployment insurance? Old-age pensions? Family allowances?

Answer—If by this is meant compulsory contributory state insurance schemes, all Social Crediters are implacably opposed to them. These schemes are a direct attack on the freedom of the individual. The compulsory contributions are a tax on incomes which reduces the standard of living. The centralized state control involved under an army of bureaucrats operating a mass of regulations is barefaced state regimentation. As Bismarck, the father of both compulsory state insurance and the plague of Nazism, stated, these schemes are a device for shackling the worker more completely to the domination of the state. They are totalitarian in conception and in operation.

With national dividends, the need for family allowances, health insurance and unemployment insurance would no longer exist. Old-age pensions could be provided to supplement national dividends so as to ensure that every person over, say, age 60 received an income of at least \$50 a month.

(18) Question — You say the operators of industry should have “adequate financial facilities to pay good wages under proper working conditions.” Who would define “adequate” facilities, “good” wages, “proper” conditions?

Answer—“Adequate financial facilities” means that producers will be able to obtain readily the short-term production loans they require for the purpose of filling orders for their goods—i.e., for the purpose of producing wanted goods up to their plant capacity. Good wages are the scale of wages that would ensure a reasonable standard of living and which would be acceptable to workers

who have the economic independence conferred on them by national dividends. The latter would likewise be the deciding factor as to what would constitute "proper" working conditions.

(19) Question—You often denounce monopolies. What steps would you take to dissolve existing monopolies, prevent new ones? How would you deal with cartels, national and international?

Answer—The simplest way to deal with a monopoly is to introduce competition against it—and it ceases to be a monopoly. Therefore, to deal with existing monopolies, facilities—financial and legal—would be provided to encourage and back the establishment of competitive undertaking.

Cartels are an infringement on the sovereign integrity of the nation and should be made illegal under severe penalties.

(20) Question—What is your policy on international trade?

Answer—International trade should be an exchange of goods and services for goods and services with other countries on a mutually acceptable basis.

(21) Question—What would you do about foreign exchange? How would you make your Canadian dollar acceptable to other countries, in order to buy goods and services from them?

Answer—The introduction of a Social Credit economy—i.e., a properly functioning economic democracy—would be resisted by powerful financial interests in other countries. In order to insulate the national economy from the manipulation of the foreign exchange rates, the settlement

of all trading balances with other countries would be carried out through the Bank of Canada. Banks would be supplied with a table of the rate of exchange between the Canadian dollar and other currencies based upon the relative price levels. An exporter of goods to another country would bill the purchaser in terms of his own currency, computed on the basis of this table—and similarly an importer would buy from another country in terms of its currency. The exporter would receive payment and the importer would make payment for their respective transactions in Canadian funds through their own bank. The transactions in the other countries would be carried out through the central bank. In this manner it would be possible to safeguard completely the exchange value of the Canadian dollar.

(22) Question—Your party speaks of licensing exports, appropriating foreign credits obtained in export trade, and using these credits to buy goods or pay debts in the country with which the credit has been established. How does this differ, if at all, from the “blocked marks” system invented by Dr. Hjalmar Schacht for Nazi Germany?

Answer—There is no intention of “licensing exports,” “appropriating credits” and so forth. All the control of foreign exchange which would be required would exist under the arrangement outlined in 21.

(23) Question—Under a Social Credit regime, if a Canadian wanted to visit Britain or the United States, how would he get the necessary sterling or U.S. dollars for the trip? Would he need a permit?

Answer—He would go to his bank and obtain the letters of credit he wanted. He certainly would require no permit to leave the country or to obtain the funds for the

purpose unless some very extraordinary conditions existed between Canada and the country he wished to visit.

(24) Question—Should Canada take any part in international monetary or trade agreements?

Answer—Yes, provided that no such agreement involved the surrender to an external authority of the sovereignty of the people of Canada in regard to their own affairs, without which there can be no democracy.

We are implacably opposed to such agreements as those suggested by the Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks Conferences, under which an external authority would exercise complete control of the national economy by an overriding control of the monetary system, and would have at its disposal armed forces of overwhelming strength to enforce its dictates. That would constitute international dictatorship organized on the Nazi model. Our national leaders must be completely asleep or must be psychopathic cases to even contemplate getting involved in such organizations.

(25) Question—Should Canada join an international organization to prevent war? If so, ought she to be bound to support the decisions of such an organization by force if need be?

Answer—Until the causes of war and revolution are removed it will be impossible to prevent war. These causes are to be found in economic and political systems which deny the individual the freedom and the economic security which alone will yield peace, prosperity and progress. People who have freedom and security cannot be readily aroused to make war on their fellow men. The most effective contribution which Canada can make to the cause of peace is by example, to show the nations of the world how

to organize their economies to provide full freedom and economic security for all.

While that is being done the only effective international organization to minimize the possibility of aggression is a free association of nations who agree that in the event of any nation permitting a unit—mechanical or human—of its armed forces to cross the frontier of another sovereign nation, she shall be deemed an aggressor and every nation in the association will automatically be at war with her. On the subjugation of the aggressor nation the political, financial, industrial and military heads will be tried for murder and punished accordingly. Every nation in the association should have defence measures adequate to discharge her responsibilities.

We are implacably opposed to the surrender of the nations control over its own armed forces in favour of an international authority. It is sheer insanity to imagine that any group of men with control of armed forces of overwhelming strength would not abuse the power this would give them. Such a group of men would be supreme dictators of the world and they are not likely to behave differently from the other power-maniacs of history who have found themselves in a similar position. "All power corrupts; absolute power corrupts absolutely."

(26) Question—What should Canada's relationship be with Britain and the British Commonwealth?

Answer—This is for the people of Canada to decide. My view is that we should maintain our sovereign integrity within the family of the British Commonwealth in the spirit of "each for all and all for each," thereby providing an example to all other countries of what the brotherhood of nations should mean.

(27) Question—Should Canada be committed to fight in the interests of any or all parts of the Commonwealth?

Answer—This is answered by the reply to your previous question. If there was a close working arrangement between the members of the British Commonwealth—each exercising complete sovereignty over its own affairs—then any attack on one member of the Commonwealth would endanger every other member and they would automatically rush to her aid.

(28) Question—Should imperial preferences be continued in any form?

Answer—Under the economic reforms of Social Credit imperial preference would not be necessary, as reciprocity in regard to export and import trade would put an end to the old struggle for markets. However, to the extent that such trade can be directed into channels which will stimulate the development of all parts of the Commonwealth to their mutual advantage, without harming other nations, this should be encouraged. That, again, is my own view. The actual policy adopted must be decided by Parliament.

(29) Question—Should Canada permit and encourage large-scale immigration after this war?

Answer—With the financial restrictions to economic development removed, Canada could absorb a steady influx of immigrants. However, the utmost care should be given to the type of immigrant admitted.

(30) Question—Should Canada have power to amend her own constitution? What method of constitutional amendment would you suggest. Would you favour increasing the power of the Federal Government or not?

Answer—A sovereign people must have power to amend their own constitution. For this purpose Canada has only to accept the provisions of the Statute of Westminster in full, and secure the amendment of the specific limitations on her sovereignty which were inserted without the people of this country being consulted.

The constitution should be subject to amendment only with the approval of a two-third majority vote of the electorate in each province.

We are implacably opposed to all centralization of power as being destructive of democracy. The electorate has the greatest control over that government which is nearest to it. Therefore, instead of increasing the authority of the Federal Government, we favour the progressive decentralization of authority to the provinces and municipalities. "That government is best which needs to govern least" should be an axiom displayed in large neon letters across the Parliament Building.

(31) Question—Should Canada have her own national flag? National anthem?

Answer—With the world in flames and civilization disintegrating in chaos and universal revolution, it does not seem very important whether Canada has her own flag and national anthem. That, no doubt, is a question on which the people will be able to express their will when we have put our house in order. That such an issue should be raised at a time like this is evidence of political bankruptcy on the part of those responsible.

(32) Question—Do you believe in the principle of equality for all races and creeds in Canada?

Answer—I recognize only one people in Canada—namely Canadians, irrespective of their racial origin.

When every Canadian has the freedom and the economic security which should be his birthright within our constitutional democracy, he will have equality of citizenship rights with all other Canadians so long as he fulfills his responsibilities as a citizen.

(33) Question—In the event of a federal election giving none of the older parties a clear majority and leaving Social Credit in a balance-of-power position, would you be willing to enter a coalition with any other party to form a government?

Answer—As I have stated, the Social Credit movement has as its objective to gain for every Canadian freedom within a properly functioning Christian democracy. We have no party political ambitions. We do not seek power. In fact we are out to abolish centralized power—whether of the state, finance or big business—and return it to the people, to whom it belongs by right. Therefore, we will work with any person or group in Parliament or out of Parliament in furthering that objective. And by the same token we will oppose and expose the policies and actions of any persons or groups which attack the freedom of the individual democracy, or Christianity. We differ from the political parties in that we are essentially an organization dedicated to getting a job done. We do not care who does it—so long as it is done. If any other organization will tackle the job it will have our enthusiastic support. If they will not, then we will carry it out ourselves. One thing we are not prepared to do—we will not compromise on principles.

Reprinted by permission of
Maclean's Magazine
A. SHNITKA, King's Printer,
Edmonton - Alberta.